

MAY. 15. 2006 4:54PM

5106630920

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NO. 742 P. 1

MAY 15 2006

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
500 12th Street, Suite 200, Oakland, CA 94607
Telephone: (510) 663-1100 Facsimile: (510) 663-0920
www.beyerlaw.com

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

May 15, 2006

Receiver: Examiner Cervetti GROUP ART 2136

FAX # : (571) 273-8300

Sender: Dean E. Wolf
Our Ref. No.: CISC204

Application No: 09/894,115

Re: Response to Notice of Non Compliant Amendment - 12 pages

Pages Including Cover Sheet(s): 13

MESSAGE:

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE

The information contained in this facsimile (FAX) message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the receiver or firm named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended receiver, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this FAX is strictly prohibited. If you have received this FAX in error, please immediately notify the sender at the telephone number provided above and return the original message to the sender at the address above via the United States Postal Service. Thank you.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NO. 742—P. 2—

MAY 15 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Huang, et al.

Attorney Docket No.: CISC204/3405

Application No.: 09/894,115

Examiner: David Garcia Cervetti

Filed: June 27, 2001

Group: 2136

Title: TECHNIQUE FOR GENERATING
CONTROL MESSAGES WITH REASON
INFORMATION BETWEEN NODES IN A
DATA NETWORK**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION:**I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by
facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office,
Commissioner for Patents, Attn: Examiner Cervetti, Fax No.
(571) 273-8380, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on: May 15, 2006Signed: 

Boyd L. Ferreira

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT AMENDMENTCommissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This amendment is submitted in response to the Communication mailed May 10, 2006 in which Applicant's response was deemed incomplete because Applicant did not address the 35 USC 112 2nd rejection. As such, this response should be treated as a complete response to the outstanding office action dated November 25, 2005.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which being on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks begin on page 12 of this paper.

Atty Docket No.: CISC204/3405

-1-

09/894,115